

AUBURN OFFICE

Auburn, CA 95603

3091 County Center Dr

530-886-3000/FAX 530-886-3080

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TAHOE OFFICE

565 W. Lake Blvd./P. O. Box 1909

530-581-6280/FAX 530-581-6282 E-Mail: planning Col

JUL 2 7 2010

Reserved for Date Stamp

PLANNING APPEALS

CDRA

The specific regulations regarding appeal procedures may be found in 17 (Planning and Zoning), and 18 (Environmental Review Ordinance)	
Last Day to Appeal 8 2 10 (5 pm) Letter Oral Testimony Zoning KS-Ab-B-100 PD= 0.83 Maps: 7-full size and 1 reduced for Planning Commission items	
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT	
1. Project name RANCHO DEL ORO ESTATES	
2. Appellant(s) MARCUS J. LO DUCA	
Address 3721 DOUGLAS BLVD., STE 300	
Roseviller CA 95861 3. Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 046-090-012	City State Zip Code
4. Application being appealed (check all those that apply Administrative Approval (AA) Use Permit (CUP/MUP) Parcel Map (P) General Plan Amendment (GPA) Specific Plan (SPA) Planning Director Interpretation (date) Minor Boundary Line Adj. (MBR)	Tentative Map (SUB) X Variance (VAA) Design Review (DSA) Rezoning (REA) Rafting Permit (RPA)
5. Whose decision is being appealed: PLANNING COMMISSION (see reverse)	
6. Appeal to be heard by: BOARD OF SUPERVI	SORS
7. Reason for appeal (attach additional sheet if necessary and be specific): SEE ATTACHED.	
(If you are appealing a project condition only, please state the condition number)	
Note: Applicants may be required to submit additional project plans/maps.	
Signature of Appellant(s)	

APPEAL OF MARCUS J. LO DUCA REGARDING THE PLACER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION'S DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE AND APPROVAL OF CERTAIN CONDITIONS OF THE VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FOR RANCHO DEL ORO ESTATES

For the Rancho Del Oro Estates project (the "Project"), the appellant appeals the Planning Commission's action to deny the variance to allow entry gates up to 8 feet tall, and the Planning Commission's action to modify conditions to the Project's vesting tentative subdivision map, as follows: (1) amended Conditions 3, 8 and 57(a); and, (2) added Condition 57(m) and Condition 131(e), the latter of which requires the Project's covenants, conditions and restrictions to allow agricultural uses in the Project, including the keeping of livestock.

The basis of this appeal is that the evidence in the administrative record before the Planning Commission did not support the Planning Commission's actions that are the focus of this appeal, but instead the evidence supported the Project as presented by the applicant for the Project. In denying the requested variance, the Planning Commission deprived the applicant of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity under the same circumstances in the same zone district, and the evidence in the administrative record failed to support any findings of the Planning Commission in denying the variance.